#### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Petition for Relief from a Conviction or Sentence By a Person in State Custody (Petition Under <u>28 U.S.C.</u> § <u>2254</u> for a Writ of Habeas Corpus)

#### **INSTRUCTIONS**

- 1. To use this form, you must be a person who is currently serving a sentence under a judgment against you in a state court. You are asking for relief from conviction of the sentence. This form is your petition for relief.
- 2. You may also use this form to challenge a state judgment that imposed a sentence to be served in the future, but you must fill in the name of the state where the judgment was entered. If you want to challenge a federal judgment that imposed a sentence to be served in the future, you should file a motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 in the federal court that entered the judgment.
- 3. Your habeas corpus petition must be filed within the 1-year statute of limitations time limit set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1). (There are limited circumstances in which the petition may be amended, within the one-year time period, to add additional claims or facts, see Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 15; or amended after the one-year period expires, in order to clarify or amplify claims which were timely presented, see United States v. Thomas, 221 F. 3d 430 (3d Cir. 2000)).
- 4. Make sure the form is typed or neatly written.
- 5. You must tell the truth and sign the form. If you make a false statement of a material fact, you may be prosecuted for perjury.
- 6. Answer all the questions. You do not need to cite law. You may submit additional pages if necessary. If you do not fill out the form properly, you will be asked to submit additional or correct information. If you want to submit a brief or argument, you must submit them in a separate memorandum.
- 7. You must pay a fee of \$5. If the fee is paid, your petition will be filed. If you cannot pay the fee, you may ask to proceed in forma pauperis (as a poor person). To do that, you must fill out an Application to Proceed in District Court without Prepaying Fees or Costs. Also, you must submit a certificate signed by an officer at the institution where you are confined showing the amount of money that the institution is holding for you.

- 8. In this petition, you may challenge the judgment entered by only one court. If you want to challenge a judgment entered by a different court (either in the same state or in different states), you must file a separate petition.
- 9. As required by 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(1), you must have exhausted all claims that you are making in your petition. This means that every claim must have been presented to each level of the state courts. If you file a petition that contains claims that are not exhausted, the federal court will dismiss your petition. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(2) provides that the federal court may deny your petition on the merits even if you have not exhausted your remedies.
- 10. As required by 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(1), a federal court must dismiss any claim in a second or successive habeas corpus petition that was presented in a prior habeas corpus petition.
- 11. As required by 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(2), a federal court must dismiss any claim in a second or successive habeas corpus petition that was not presented in a prior habeas corpus petition unless you show:
  - (A) the claim relies on a new rule of constitutional law, made retroactive to cases on collateral review by the U.S. Supreme Court, that was previously unavailable; or
  - (B) (i) the factual predicate for the claim could not have been discovered previously through the exercise of due diligence, and (ii) the facts underlying the claim, if proven and viewed in light of the evidence as a whole, would be sufficient to establish by clear and convincing evidence that, but for constitutional error, no reasonable fact finder would have found you guilty of the offense in question.

Before such a second or successive petition may be filed in the district court, however, the petitioner must move in the court of appeals for an Order authorizing the district court to consider the petition. Petitioner's motion for such an Order must be determined by a three judge panel of the court of appeals, which must grant or deny the motion within 30 days. The court of appeals may grant the motion only if it determines that the petition makes a prima facie showing that it satisfies either (A) or (B) above.

12. When you have completed this form, send the original and **these instructions** to the Clerk of the United States District Court at this address:

Clerk United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania 601 Market Street, Room 2609 Philadelphia, PA 19106

- 13. <u>CAUTION</u>: You must include in this petition all the grounds for relief from the conviction or sentence that you challenge and you must state the facts that support each ground. If you fail to set forth all the grounds in this petition, you may be barred from presenting additional grounds at a later date.
- 14. <u>CAPITAL CASES</u>: If you are under a sentence of death, you are entitled to the assistance of counsel and should request the appointment of counsel.

# PETITION UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 2254 FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS BY A PERSON IN STATE CUSTODY

United States District Court	District: Eastern District of Pennsylvania
Name (under which you were convicted): Major George Tillery	Docket or Case No.:
Place of Confinement: SCI Chester	Prisoner No.: AM 9786
Petitioner (Include the name underwhich you you were convicted):  Major G. Tillery	Respondent (Name of Warden, Superintendent, Jailor, or authorized person having custody of petitioner):  Kenneth Eason, Acting Superintendent, State
V	Correctional Institution at Chester and
	The District Attorney of the County of: Philadelphia
	and
	The Attorney General of the State of: Pennsylvania
	PETITION
	ntered the judgment of conviction you are challenging: of Common Pleas, Criminal Division
•	
Philadelphia, PA 19107	
(b) Criminal docket or case number (i	f you know):CR-51-CR-0305681-1984
2. (a) Date of judgment of conviction (if	you know): May 29, 1985
(b) Date of sentencing:	December 9, 1986
3. Length of sentence: Life imprise 5-10 year se	onment without the possibility of parole, with consecutive entence
4. In this case, were you convicted on mo	ore than one count or of more than one crime? X Yes  No
	riminal conspiracy, possessing instruments of crime sault.

## Casee2020941-0260504756 TotallodumPatge: 627ed 06035625 iledag5/07/2020

X (1) Not Guilty	(2) Guilty   (4) Insanity plea  (b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or charge and a not guilty plea to another count or charge and a not guilty plea to another count or charge and a not guilty plea to another count or charge and a not guilty plea to another count or charge and a not guilty plea to another count or charge and a not guilty plea to another count or charge and a not guilty plea to another count or charge and a not guilty plea to another count or charge and a not guilty plea to another count or charge and a not guilty plea to another count or charge and a not guilty plea to another count or charge and a not guilty plea to another count or charge and a not guilty plea to another count or charge and a not guilty plea to another count or charge and a not guilty plea to another count or charge and anot guilty plea to another count or charge and another count or charge another count or charge and another count or charge another count or	(a) What v	as your plea? (Check one)		
(c) If you went to trial, what kind of trial did you have? (Check one)    May	(b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or charge and a not guilty plea to another count or chardid you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to? N/A  (c) If you went to trial, what kind of trial did you have? (Check one)	$\mathbf{X}$ (1)	Not Guilty	$\square$ (3)	Nolo contendere (no contest)
did you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to?N/A	did you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to? N/A  (c) If you went to trial, what kind of trial did you have? (Check one)    Jury	$\square$ (2)	Guilty	□ (4)	Insanity plea
Did you testify at a pretrial hearing, trial, or a post-trial hearing?  ☐ Yes ☒ No  Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction?  ☒ Yes ☐ No  If you did appeal, answer the following:  (a) Name of court: Superior Court of Pennsylvania  (b) Docket or case number (if youknow): 3297 PHL 1986  (c) Result: Conviction affirmed  (d) Date of result (if youknow): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989) (unpub.)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during closing argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective order concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testimony	Did you testify at a pretrial hearing, trial, or a post-trial hearing?  Yes No  Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction?  Yes No  If you did appeal, answer the following:  (a) Name of court: Superior Court of Pennsylvania  (b) Docket or case number (if youknow): 3297 PHL 1986  (c) Result: Conviction affirmed  (d) Date of result (if youknow): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during of argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testi	•		_	
Did you testify at a pretrial hearing, trial, or a post-trial hearing?  ☐ Yes ☒ No  Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction?  ☒ Yes ☐ No  If you did appeal, answer the following:  (a) Name of court: Superior Court of Pennsylvania  (b) Docket or case number (if youknow): 3297 PHL 1986  (c) Result: Conviction affirmed  (d) Date of result (if youknow): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989) (unpub.)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during closing argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective order concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testimony	Did you testify at a pretrial hearing, trial, or a post-trial hearing?  ☐ Yes   ☒ No  Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction?  ☒ Yes ☐ No  If you did appeal, answer the following:  (a) Name of court: Superior Court of Pennsylvania  (b) Docket or case number (if you know): 3297 PHL 1986  (c) Result: Conviction affirmed  (d) Date of result (if you know): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during of argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testi	 			
Did you testify at a pretrial hearing, trial, or a post-trial hearing?  Yes No  Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction?  Yes No  If you did appeal, answer the following:  (a) Name of court: Superior Court of Pennsylvania  (b) Docket or case number (if you know): 3297 PHL 1986  (c) Result: Conviction affirmed  (d) Date of result (if you know): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if you know): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989) (unpub.)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during closing argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective order concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testimony	Did you testify at a pretrial hearing, trial, or a post-trial hearing?  Yes No  Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction?  Yes No  If you did appeal, answer the following:  (a) Name of court:	(c) If you	vent to trial, what kind of trial dic	d you hav	ve? (Check one)
□ Yes ☒ No  Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction?  ☒ Yes □ No  If you did appeal, answer the following:  (a) Name of court: Superior Court of Pennsylvania  (b) Docket or case number (if youknow): 3297 PHL 1986  (c) Result: Conviction affirmed  (d) Date of result (if youknow): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989) (unpub.)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during closing argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective order concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testimony	□ Yes ☑ No  Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction? ☑ Yes □ No  If you did appeal, answer the following:  (a) Name of court: Superior Court of Pennsylvania  (b) Docket or case number (if youknow): 3297 PHL 1986  (c) Result: Conviction affirmed  (d) Date of result (if youknow): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during of argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the process of	🛚 Jury	☐ Judge only		
Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction?  MYes □ No  If you did appeal, answer the following:  (a) Name of court: Superior Court of Pennsylvania  (b) Docket or case number (if youknow): 3297 PHL 1986  (c) Result: Conviction affirmed  (d) Date of result (if youknow): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989) (unpub.)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during closing argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective order concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testimony	Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction?  MYes □ No  If you did appeal, answer the following:  (a) Name of court: Superior Court of Pennsylvania  (b) Docket or case number (if youknow): 3297 PHL 1986  (c) Result: Conviction affirmed  (d) Date of result (if youknow): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during of argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the prosecutorial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the prosecutorial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the prosecutorial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the prosecutorial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the prosecutorial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the prosecutorial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the prosecutorial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the prosecutorial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the prosecutorial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the prosecutorial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the prosecutorial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the prosecutorial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the prosecutorial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the prosecutorial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise (Robert Mickens) ba	Did you tes	ify at a pretrial hearing, trial, or a	post-tria	l hearing?
My Yes □ No  If you did appeal, answer the following:  (a) Name of court: Superior Court of Pennsylvania  (b) Docket or case number (if you know): 3297 PHL 1986  (c) Result: Conviction affirmed  (d) Date of result (if you know): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if you know): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989) (unpub.)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during closing argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective order concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testimony	Myes □ No  If you did appeal, answer the following:  (a) Name of court: Superior Court of Pennsylvania  (b) Docket or case number (if youknow): 3297 PHL 1986  (c) Result: Conviction affirmed  (d) Date of result (if youknow): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during of argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise (Robert Mickens) ba	☐ Yes	X No		
If you did appeal, answer the following:  (a) Name of court: Superior Court of Pennsylvania  (b) Docket or case number (if youknow): 3297 PHL 1986  (c) Result: Conviction affirmed  (d) Date of result (if youknow): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989) (unpub.)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during closing argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective order concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testimony	If you did appeal, answer the following:  (a) Name of court: Superior Court of Pennsylvania  (b) Docket or case number (if youknow): 3297 PHL 1986  (c) Result: Conviction affirmed  (d) Date of result (if youknow): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during of argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise (Robert Mickens)	Did you app	eal from the judgment of convict	ion?	
Superior Court of Pennsylvania  (b) Docket or case number (if youknow): 3297 PHL 1986  (c) Result: Conviction affirmed  (d) Date of result (if youknow): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989) (unpub.)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during closing argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective order concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testimony	(a) Name of court: Superior Court of Pennsylvania  (b) Docket or case number (if youknow): 3297 PHL 1986  (c) Result: Conviction affirmed  (d) Date of result (if youknow): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during of argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise (Robert Mickens)	X Yes	□ No		
(b) Docket or case number (if youknow): 3297 PHL 1986  (c) Result: Conviction affirmed  (d) Date of result (if youknow): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989) (unpub.)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during closing argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective order concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testimony	(b) Docket or case number (if youknow): 3297 PHL 1986  (c) Result: Conviction affirmed  (d) Date of result (if youknow): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during of argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise (Robert Mickens) based on surprise (Robert Mickens) based on surprise (Robert Mickens)	If you did a	opeal, answer the following:		
(b) Docket or case number (if youknow):3297 PHL 1986 (c) Result:Conviction affirmed (d) Date of result (if youknow):May 30, 1989 (e) Citation to the case (if youknow):Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989) (unpub.) (f) Grounds raised:Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during closing argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective order concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testimony	(b) Docket or case number (if youknow):3297 PHL 1986 (c) Result:Conviction affirmed (d) Date of result (if youknow):May 30, 1989 (e) Citation to the case (if youknow):Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989) (f) Grounds raised:Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during of argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise (Rober	(a) Name (	of court:	Supe	erior Court of Pennsylvania
(d) Date of result (if youknow): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989) (unpub.)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during closing argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective order concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testimony	(d) Date of result (if youknow): May 30, 1989  (e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989)  (f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during of argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing the concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise (Robert Mickens) based			2205	PHL 1986
<ul> <li>(e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989) (unpub.)</li> <li>(f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during closing argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective order concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testimony</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>(e) Citation to the case (if youknow): Com. v. Tillery, 563 A.2d 195 (Pa. Super. 1989)</li> <li>(f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during of argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testing.</li> </ul>	(c) Result:		Con	viction affirmed
(f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during closing argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective order concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testimony	(f) Grounds raised: Prosecutorial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct during of argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testi	(d) Date of	result (if youknow):		
argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective order concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testimony	argument, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, wrongful grant of protective concerning trial witness (Robert Mickens) based on surprise, prejudicial testi				
		argu	ment, ineffective assistance	of trial	counsel, wrongful grant of protective order
	(g) Did you seek further review by a higher state court?	(a) D' 1	and finished and the first terms of the second seco	-4-4- · ·	<b>4</b> 0

#### $\textbf{Casee2020941-0260504765} \textbf{of the first Color of the first Color o$

` ′	Name of court:	
(2)		Supreme Court of Pennsylvania
	Docket or case number (if youknow): _	
(3)	Result:	
(4)	Date of result (if youknow):	March 5, 1990
(5)	Citation to the case (if youknow):	Com. v. Tillery, 593 A.2d 841 (Pa. 1990) (unp
(6)	Grounds raised:	Same as court below
ı) Dio	d you file a petition for certiorari in the Ui	nited States Supreme Court?
	☐ Yes           Yo	
•	es, answer the following:	
(2)	Result:	
(3)	Date of result (if you know):	
(4)	Citation to the case (if youknow):	
	ner than the direct appeals listed above, he motions concerning this judgment of conv	ave you previously filed any other petitions, applications, viction in any state court?
	X Yes □ No	
your	answer to Question 10 was "Yes," give th	e following information:
a) (1)	Name of court:	Philadelphia County Court of Common Pleas
	Docket or case number (if youknow): _	
(3)	Date of filing (if youknow):	February 18, 1996
(4)	Nature of the proceeding:	PCRA Petition
		stance of trial counsel, Joseph Santaguida, based on
tı	rial counsel's prior representation of	of John Pickens, the surviving victim of the shooting
	Petitioner was allegedly involved in	
1		

10.

## $\textbf{Casee2020941-0260504756} \textbf{TribetumPage: 629d 06035625} \textbf{IPBENT:DiotumPage: 629d 06035625} \textbf{IPBE$

	(6)	Did you receive	a hearing where eviden	ce was given on your petition, application, or motion?
		☐ Yes	🛚 No	
	(7)	Result:		_
	(8)	Date of result (i	f youknow):	
(b)	If y	ou filed any seco	nd petition, application,	or motion, give the same information:
	(1)	Name of court:		Philadelphia County Court of Common Pleas
	(2)	Docket or case	number (if youknow): _	CP-51-CR-0305681-1984
	(3)	Date of filing (i	f youknow):	August 13, 2007
	(4)	Nature of the pr	oceeding:	PCRA Petition
	(5)	Grounds raised:	:	
	` '	4.		nwealth suppressed evidence of a plea deal
				Emanuel Claitt, would received no more than 10
				ch he was sentenced on September 17, 1981.
				wealth suppressed, and knowingly permitted
		,		ering, plea deals offered to an alleged eyewitness,
		ROUC	or mickens.	
	(6)	Did you receive	a hearing where eviden	ce was given on your petition, application, or motion?
	(0)	☐ Yes	X No	ce was given on your petition, application, or motion?
		LI I CS	22.110	
	(7)	Result:		
	` ′	`	•	
(c)	If v	ou filed any third	l petition, application, or	motion, give the same information:
(0)			pointion, application, of	Philadelphia County Court of Common Pleas
			number (if youknow): _	CP-51-CR-0305681-1984
				June 15, 2016
		_	f youknow):	PCRA Petition
	(4)	Nature of the pr		_
	(5)	Grounds raised:	1) Factual Innoce	
				brication of testimony, knowingly permitting perjure
				be presented, suppression of impeachment and vidence by the Commonwealth, and prosecutorial
		-		vidence by the Commonwealth, and prosecutorial
			misconduct.	

	(6) D	id you receiv □ Yes	re a hearing what No	here ev	vidence was	given on your	petition, application, or motion?	
	(7) R	esult:						
	(8) D	ate of result	(if youknow):					
(d)		ou appeal to t ation, or mot		te cour	t having jur	isdiction over t	the action taken on your petition,	
	(1)	First petition	on:	X	Yes		No	
	(2)	Second pet	ition:	$\mathbf{X}$	Yes		No	
	(3)	Third petiti	on:	$\mathbf{X}$	Yes		No	
Cor	nstitutio	on, laws, or	treaties of the	e Unite	ed States. A		u are being held in violation a	
CA cou fort	UTION out reme th all the COUND Fact	N: To procee edies on each e grounds in ONE: ual Innoce	n ground on weathis petition, you	al cour which y you ma	t, you must you request ay be barred Arising Fr	action by the from presenting from a Funda	t exhaust (use up) your available federal court. Also, if you fail ng additional grounds at a later demental Miscarriage of Justin Actual Innocence	to se late.
(a)	Suppo	orting facts (I	Oo not argue c	or cite l	law. Just sta	te the specific	facts that support your claim.):	
	As n	nore fully s	set out in the	e atta	ched petiti	ion, both alle	eged eyewitnesses	
					_		estimony at trial was false a	nd
	man	ufactured	by the Com	monv	vealth, and	d that the Co	ommonwealth solicited	
	perj	ured testim	ony regard	ing pl	ea deals o	offered to bo	th witnesses.	

11.

(b)	If y	ou did not exhaust your state remedies on Ground One, explain why:
	]	The claims are exhausted. They were raised in Petitioner's third (2016) PCRA
		and appealed to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.
(c)	Dir	rect Appeal of Ground One:
	(1)	If you appealed from the judgment of conviction, did you raise this issue?  ☐ Yes ☒ No
	(2)	If you did not raise this issue in your direct appeal, explain why? The Commonwealth concealed evidence of the plea deals, as well as the
		threats and inducements provided to the witnesses, at trial and afterwards.
( <b>d</b> )		st-Conviction Proceedings:
	(1)	Did you raise this issue through a post-conviction motion or petition for habeas corpus in a state trial court?  Yes □ No
	(2)	If your answer to Question (d)(1) is "Yes," state:
		Type of motion or petition: PCRA Petition
		Name and location of the court where the motion or petition was filed:  Philadelphia County Court of Common Pleas
		Docket or case number (if you know): CP-51-CR-0305681-1984
		Date of the court's decision: September 26, 2016
		Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):  Petition denied on state (PCRA) timeliness grounds. A copy of the opinion
-		is included in the exhibits to the attached petition.
	(3)	Did you receive a hearing on your motion or petition?
	(4)	Did you appeal from the denial of your motion or petition? $\mathbf{X}$ Yes $\square$ No
	(5)	If your answer to Question (d)(4) is "Yes," did you raise this issue in the appeal?  X Yes □ No
	(6)	If your answer to Question (d)(4) is "Yes," state:
		Name and location of the court where the appeal was filed:  Superior Court of Pennsylvania
		Docket or case number (if you know): 3270 EDA 2016
		Date of the court's decision:  June 11, 2018

		Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):  PCRA court decision affirmed; allocatur denied by Supreme Court of Pennsylvania
	(7)	If your answer to Question (d)(4) or Question (d)(5) is "No," explain why you did not raise this issue:
(e)		<b>rer Remedies:</b> Describe any other procedures (such as habeas corpus, administrative remedies, ) that you have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground One:
		N/A
	Sup As	The Commonwealth Manufactured False Inculpatory Evidence and Suppressed al. Exculpatory Evidence in Violation of Due Process (Napue/Brady)  sporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim.):  more fully set out in the attached petition, the Commonwealth knowingly permitted, it manufactured, perjured testimony including all the substantive testimony at trial.
	Th	e Commonwealth also concealed the existence of open charges and plea deals reived by the two alleged eyewitnesses, Emanuel Claitt and Robert Mickens.
(b)	-	ou did not exhaust your state remedies on Ground Two, explain why:he claims are exhausted; they were appealed to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.
(c)		ect Appeal of Ground Two:  If you appealed from the judgment of conviction, did you raise this issue?  \[ \sum \text{Yes} \sum \text{N} \text{No} \]

		The Commonwealth concealed evidence of the plea deals, as well as the
		threats and inducements provided to the witnesses, at trial and afterwards.
( <b>d</b> )	Pos	st-Conviction Proceedings:
	(1)	Did you raise this issue through a post-conviction motion or petition for habeas corpus in a state trial court?
		XI Yes □ No
	(2)	If your answer to Question (d)(1) is "Yes," state:
		Type of motion or petition: PCRA Petition
		Name and location of the court where the motion or petition was filed:
		Philadelphia County Court of Common Pleas
		Docket or case number (if you know): CP-51-CR-0305681-1984
		Date of the court's decision: September 26, 2016
_		Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):  Denial of relief on state (PCRA) timeliness grounds. A copy of the decision is included in the exhibits to the attached Petition.
	(3)	Did you receive a hearing on your motion or petition?
	(4)	Did you appeal from the denial of your motion or petition?  Yes   No
	(5)	If your answer to Question (d)(4) is "Yes," did you raise this issue in the appeal?  Yes □ No
	(6)	If your answer to Question (d)(4) is "Yes," state:
		Name and location of the court where the appeal was filed:  Superior Court of Pennsylvania
		Docket or case number (if you know): 3270 EDA 2016
		Date of the court's decision: June 11, 2018
		Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):  PCRA Court decision affirmed. A copy of the opinion is included in the
		exhibits to the attached Petition.
	(7)	If your answer to Question (d)(4) or Question (d)(5) is "No," explain why you did not raise this issue:

(-)	Oth	er Remedies: Describe any other procedures (such as habeas corpus, administrative remedies,
	etc.	) that you have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground Two:
		N/A
GR	OUI	ND THREE:
(a)	Sup	porting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim.):
(h)	If vo	ou did not exhaust your state remedies on Ground Three, explain why:
(0)	11 )	a did not emiddet your state remedies on Oround Timee, explain why.
(c)	Dir	ect Appeal of Ground Three:
	(1)	If you appealed from the judgment of conviction, did you raise this issue?
		☐ Yes ☐ No
	(2)	If you did not raise this issue in your direct appeal, explain why?
( <b>d</b> )	Pos	t-Conviction Proceedings:
	(1)	Did you raise this issue through a post-conviction motion or petition for habeas corpus in a state trial court?
		☐ Yes ☐ No
	(2)	
	(2)	If your answer to Question (d)(1) is "Yes," state:

		Name and location of the court who	ere the motion or petition was t	filed:			
		Docket or case number (if you kno	ow):				
		Date of the court's decision:					
		Result (attach a copy of the court's	s opinion or order, if available)	:			
	(3) l	Did you receive a hearing on your n	notion or petition?		Yes		No
	(4) l	Did you appeal from the denial of yo	our motion or petition?		Yes		No
	(5)	If your answer to Question (d)(4) is $\Box$ Yes $\Box$ No	is "Yes," did you raise this issue	e in the appea	al?		
	(6)	If your answer to Question (d)(4) is	s "Yes," state:				
		Name and location of the court who	ere the appeal was filed:				
		Docket or case number (if you kno	ow):				<u> </u>
		Date of the court's decision:					
		Result (attach a copy of the court's	s opinion or order, if available)	:			<u>—</u>
	(7)	If your answer to Question (d)(4) of issue:			u did not	raise thi	s
(e)		ner Remedies: Describe any other p ) that you have used to exhaust you	•			nedies,	
GR	OU!	ND FOUR:					
(a)	Sup	oporting facts (Do not argue or cite	law. Just state the specific fact	s that suppor	t your clai	m.):	

(b)	If y	ou did not exhaust your state remedies on Ground Four, explain why	:			<u> </u>
						_ _ _
(c)		rect Appeal of Ground Four:				
	(1)	If you appealed from the judgment of conviction, did you raise this i  ☐ Yes ☐ No	ssue?			
	(2)	If you did not raise this issue in your direct appeal, explain why?				<del></del>
( <b>d</b> )		st-Conviction Proceedings:  Did you raise this issue through a post-conviction motion or petition state trial court?	n for habe	as corpus	in a	
		□ Yes □ No				
	(2)	If your answer to Question (d)(1) is "Yes," state:				
		Type of motion or petition:				
		Name and location of the court where the motion or petition was file	ed:			
		Docket or case number (if you know):				
		Date of the court's decision:				
		Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):				
	(3)	Did you receive a hearing on your motion or petition?		Yes		No
	(4)	Did you appeal from the denial of your motion or petition?		Yes		No

	☐ Yes ☐ No
(6	) If your answer to Question (d)(4) is "Yes," state:
	Name and location of the court where the appeal was filed:
	Docket or case number (if you know):
	Date of the court's decision:
	Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):
(7	If your answer to Question (d)(4) or Question (d)(5) is "No," explain why you did not raise this issue:
(e) <b>O</b>	ther Remedies: Describe any other procedures (such as habeas corpus, administrative remedies,
	ther Remedies: Describe any other procedures (such as habeas corpus, administrative remedies, c.) that you have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground Four:
etc	
eto ————————————————————————————————————	answer these additional questions about the petition you are filing:
eto ————————————————————————————————————	answer these additional questions about the petition you are filing:  ave all grounds for relief that you have raised in this petition been presented to the highest state court
Please (a) Haha	answer these additional questions about the petition you are filing:  ave all grounds for relief that you have raised in this petition been presented to the highest state court ving jurisdiction?  Yes
Please (a) Haha	answer these additional questions about the petition you are filing:  ave all grounds for relief that you have raised in this petition been presented to the highest state court aving jurisdiction?  Yes □ No  your answer is "No," state which grounds have not been so presented and give your reason(s) for not
Please (a) Haha	answer these additional questions about the petition you are filing:  ave all grounds for relief that you have raised in this petition been presented to the highest state court aving jurisdiction?  Yes □ No  your answer is "No," state which grounds have not been so presented and give your reason(s) for not

	ms in this Petition were raised in Petitioner's 2016 PCRA petition.
	y filed any type of petition, application, or motion in a federal court regarding the challenge in this petition?
X Yes	□ No
issues raised, the da	ame and location of the court, the docket or case number, the type of proceeding, the te of the court's decision, and the result for each petition, application, or motion filed. y court opinion or order, if available
Eastern Di	strict of Pennsylvania. Docket No. 2:99-cv-065160-BWK (filed Dec. 22, 199
The groun	ds raised were the same as Petitioner's first (1996) PCRA petition.
An interlo	cutory appeal was taken to the Third Circuit, No. 00-3818. The petition_
was denie	d on July 29, 2003. An appeal was taken to the Third Circuit, which
Do you have any pe	tef on July 29, 2005 (No. 03-3616). Opinions are in the exhibits to attached P tition or appeal now pending (filed and not decided yet) in any court, either state or ment you are challenging?
☐ Yes	X No
	ame and location of the court, the docket or case number, the type of proceeding, and
Give the name and a judgment you are ch	address, if you know, of each attorney who represented you in the following stages of the allenging:

(c) At trial: Joseph Santaguida, 121 S. Broad St., Philadelphia, PA 19102	
(d) At sentencing: Joseph Santaguida, 121 S. Broad St., Philadelphia, PA 19102	
(e) On appeal: James S. Bruno, 150 S. Easton Rd., Glenside, PA 19038	-
(f) In any post-conviction proceeding: Richard P. Hunter, Jr., 522 Lincoln Hill Rd., Newtown	ı, PA 18
Brian J. McMonagel, 1845 Walnut St., 19th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19103	
(g) On appeal from any ruling against you in a post-conviction proceeding:	
Stephen P. Patrizio, 1500 JFK Boulevard, Suite 1205, Philadelphia, PA 19102	_
Do you have any future sentence to serve after you complete the sentence for the judgment that you are challenging?	
are challenging?	
☐ Yes                                    Yas	
(a) If so, give the name and location of the court that imposed the other sentence you will serve in the future:	
(b) Give the date the other sentence was imposed:	-
(c) Give the length of the othersentence:	-
(d) Have you filed, or do you plan to file, any petition that challenges the judgment or sentence to be served in the future?	
□ Yes □ No	
TIMELINESS OF PETITION: If your judgment of conviction became final over one year ago, you must explain why the one-year statute of limitations as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) does not bar your petition*  As detailed in the attached Petition, Petitioner qualifies for an equitable exception	
to AEDPA's statute of limitations. He raises a gateway claim of actual innocence	
(a Schlup claim) based on the falsification of the entirety of the substantive evidence	
against him at trial, based on the declarations of the only two alleged eyewitnesses to	
the shooting he was convicted of. Petitioner also qualifies for equitable tolling, on the	
basis that he has exercised due diligence and shows extraordinary circumstances.	

* The Antiterr	orism and	Effective	Death	Penalty	Act o	f 1996	("AEDPA")	as	contained	in 2	28	U.S.C. §
2244(d) provides in par	t that:											

- (1) A one-year period of limitation shall apply to an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State Court. The limitation period shall run from the latest of -
  - (A) the date on which the judgment became final by the conclusion of direct review or the expiration of the time for seeking such review;
  - (B) the date on which the impediment to filing an application created by State action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the applicant was prevented from filing by such state action;
  - (C) the date on which the constitutional right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or
  - (D) the date on which the factual predicate of the claim or claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence.
- (2) The time during which a properly filed application for State post-conviction or other collateral review with respect to the pertinent judgment or claim is pending shall not be counted toward any period of limitation under this subsection.

Therefore, petitioner asks that the Court grant the following relief:
1) Grant an evidentiary hearing and discovery;
2) Reverse his conviction; 3) Bar re-trial, and
4) Issue a writ of habeas corpus and order his immediate release,
or any other relief to which petitioner may be entitled.
Signature of Attorney (if any)

## Casse 2020 9:4/1026 DEGRETENTO Octume Plage: 16/4/21 06 Destre File ch. (0.5/107/2020

PAE AO 241 (Rev. 07/10)	19
I declare (or certify, verify, or state) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus was placed in the prison mailing system on	_•
Executed (signed) on $4/30/30$ (date).	
May Signature of Petitioner	
If the person signing is not the petitioner, state the relationship to petitioner and explain why petitioner is not significant.	gning
Although this form is signed by the Petitioner, it is being mailed and served	
from outside the prison system, as detailed in the attached Certificate of Service.	